



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/364,070	07/30/1999	AKIHIRO SUZUKI	3327.2062-01	8907

22852 7590 10/24/2002

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09364070			

EXAMINER	
Poon	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	10

DATE MAILED:

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☒ is extended to run 4 months ~~or continues to run~~ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 10/3/2002 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☒ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 1-6, 15, 16

However:

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because see attachment

5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☐ Other

Gabriel Garcia

GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2624

Attachment

With respect to applicant's argument that Sugiura does not show a specified number of copies of the job are output, has been considered.

In reply: Fig. 10C, Sugiura teaches, for example, one copy of the document from host B is printed. The one copy of the document is a specified number because it is not two copies, not three copies but one copy. Therefore, one copy is a specified number.

With respect to applicant's argument that Sugiura fails to teach the prevention of the issuance of a processing request until the job in the processing start wait state is released from the processing start wait state by a time out has been considered.

In reply: Sugiura et al. teach: control information specifying means (the program code that allows users to assign the printing of A1, A2, A3, and A4, fig. 10A) for specifying a processing start wait (connected to BMM, column 8, line 44) for a leading document (A1) among the plurality of documents; and when a job is placed in the processing start wait state, prevents the issue of processing requests with respect to a document for that job (when the document is in BMM state, the program cannot request process of print, fig. 11B) and documents for subsequent jobs until that job is released from the processing start wait state by a user's instruction or a timeout (the time is complete from S6 to S8, fig. 11B).

Fig. 11B, S6-S8, Sugiura, teaches a document cannot jump from BMM acquirement to process of print without being wait for extension and wait for print step being executed. The wait

Art Unit: 2624

process would require time. When the wait process is ended (wait time is out), the document would then be processed.

With respect to applicant's argument that Sugiura does not teach a job scheduling device using a plurality of queues, has been considered.

Column 8, lines 19 teaches to use print queues for host A.

With respect to applicant's argument that Sugiura does not teach recovers the previous state of each of the jobs being held in the plurality of queues, if any failure occurred while the jobs are being scheduled by the scheduling means, has been considered.

In reply: Sugiura et al. teach a job scheduling device (fig. 6) and recovery means (function part of the print control that renew the print job from stop state to non stop state, (BMM acquirement, extension, print, paper discharge), fig. 10C) for recovering previous state of each of the jobs (A1, A2, A3, A4) being held in the plurality of queues, at the time of recovery from a failure, (printing for host A requires A3 size while A4 paper is contained in the hopper, column 8, lines 30-35) if any failure occurred while the jobs are being scheduled by the scheduling means. (Fig. 10A, fig. 10B)

With respect to applicant's argument that Sugiura does not teach attribute modifying means for modifying attribute information only when a print job can be changed at the time an instruction for modifying the attribute information of the print job is received, has been considered.

Art Unit: 2624

In reply: Sugiura et al. teaches attribute modifying means (the function part of the print control that is controlling the change of paper feed inlet pattern, column 10, lines 60-65) for modifying the attribute information (definition of the paper inlet pattern, column 10, line 64) only when a print job can be changed at the time that an instruction (command generated after depressing the set key, column 10, line 61) for modifying the attribute information (paper feed inlet, column 10, lines 19-21) of the print job is received, and when the instruction is free from errors (the attribute information can only be changed by a user's program, column 10, lines 45-60, when the instruction is programed wrong by the user, the correct instruction cannot be changed).

With respect to applicant's argument that Lobiondo does not teach attribute information adding means for adding information relating to job weight control, has been considered.

In reply: Lobiondo teaches a job processing system (fig. 1) comprising a terminal equipment workstation, column 3, lines 29-35) for issuing a processing request, (column 3, lines 55-60) attribute information adding means (column 3, lines 33-35) for adding information relating to job wait control (the time the job is to be finished, column 4, line 40-45) and message to information relating to the wait control to the job request as attribute information (information entered, column 3, lines 50-65).

With respect to applicant's argument that Lobiondo does not teach wait control, has been considered.

In reply: Lobiondo wait control (the time the job is to be finished, column 4, line 40-45)

Art Unit: 2624

With respect to applicant's argument that the references do not teach output result control means, has been considered.

In reply: Sugiura teaches output result control means (the function part of the printer control that carries out printing in accordance with the print request, column 3, lines 33-35) which, upon reference (in accordance, column 3, line 33-34) to the information items (printing specification, column 3, lines 23-25, fig. 7) which specify a job and a document with respect to the job stored in the queue, controls the processing request issued to the job execution section in such a way that a specified number of copies (fig. 10c shows one copy of each job are output) of the job are output using the information (print specification, fig. 7) which specifies a job output method.

Sugiura does not teach adding information relating to the number of copies of the job and information relating to a job output result to the job request as job attribute information; and a specified number of copies of the job are only output in a collated manner if collation processing is specified or a specified number of copies of the job are only output in an uncollated manner if uncollation processing is specified.

Rourke, in the same area of programming print job teaches: adding information relating to the number of copies of the job (column 8, lines 24-25) and information relating to a job output result to the job request as job attribute information; and a specified number of copies of the job are only output in a collated manner if collation processing is specified (column 8, lines 23-46) or

Art Unit: 2624

a specified number of copies of the job are only output in an uncollated manner if uncollation processing is specified.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sugiura to include: adding information relating to the number of copies of the job and information relating to a job output result to the job request as job attribute information; and a specified number of copies of the job are only output in a collated manner if collation processing is specified or a specified number of copies of the job are only output in an uncollated manner if uncollation processing is specified.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sugiura by the teaching of Rourke because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed users to select the number of copies of a print job to be printed, and (b) it would have allowed users to set a print job according to his own preference such as printing a print job collated or uncollated.

With respect to applicant's argument that the references do not teach when a job is placed in the password input state, prevents the issue of processing requests with respect to a document of the job and document of subsequent jobs until the job is released from the password input wait state by a time out, has been considered.

In reply: Sugiura et al. teach a control state setting means which, (S15, fig. 11B) if the input wait is set to information which specifies the leading document of the job stored in the queuing means, renders that job in an input wait state, (S6, fig. 11B) wherein the job scheduling

Art Unit: 2624

device sequentially retrieves jobs stored in the queuing means when the job execution section becomes enabled to accept processing, (fig. 10A) issues a processing request (S17, fig. 11B) for a corresponding document when there is information specifying a document to which a processing request can be issued, and when a job is placed in the input wait state, prevents the issue of processing requests with respect to a document for that job (when the document is in BMM state, the program cannot request process of print, fig. 11B) and documents for subsequent jobs until that job is released from the input wait state by a user's instruction or a timeout (the time is complete from S6 to S8, fig. 11B).

Sugiura does not teach using a password to control processing of documents.

Nezu, in the same area of programming print job teaches: to use a password (collation key abstract) for controlling the precessing of print jobs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sugiura to include: using a password to control processing of the document.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sugiura by the teaching of Nezu because of the following reasons: (a) it would have added security in the printing process for the users by allowing users having the correct password to access a print job.